

Ifeka. She discusses the image of Goa, that is the "Golden Goa" myth so beloved of art historians and travel agents. Using various mostly non-literary sources she is able to debunk this nonsense. She prefers instead "Goa Indica".

Two other articles are devoted to the *carreira*, that is the voyage between Portugal and India. Steensgaard, in a second outstanding contribution, analyzes the return cargoes of Portuguese ships, and has important things to say about cargoes and ship sizes in the sixteenth century. This intelligent and careful analysis is much to be preferred to a rather thin contribution by G. Bouchon. She is concerned with the early *carreira*. After a very diffuse start, she tells us there are more sources available for this topic than we used to think, but she discreetly tells us little about what they say. Perhaps we will find out more in Lisbon this year. It is also a pity to find, for the only time in this book, traces of Eurocentrism. Thus to say (p. 46) that da Gama in 1502 "confirmed the split with Calicut" is a strange gloss indeed on the atrocities he perpetrated on this occasion.

The remainder of the essays are more various. L. Blussé and G. Winius write well on the origins and course of Luso-Dutch hostility in Asia. They make the important case that it was only from 1636 that hostilities spread to the Indian Ocean area. John Correia-Afonso provides an agreeable little account of a description of 1665 of six land routes between India and Europe, which it was hoped could be used as an alternative to the *carreira*, at least for couriers. J. P. Bachelier e Oliveira writes on Pombal's ruthless suppression of the Jesuits in Goa in 1759, and finally A. T. de Matos gives us a rather confusing account of Portuguese state finances in the period of Spanish rule. He demonstrates that the budgets of this time all show a surplus. Nevertheless, the state was in financial straits. The explanation is corruption and malfeasance. But if the budgets were in surplus, then where is the crisis? Perhaps the budgets are simply unreliable, perhaps they are in surplus because they include extraordinary revenues, such as loans, or perhaps they do not include extraordinary expenses, such as the very costly naval expeditions of the period. We can at least thank this author for raising the problem; we have yet to find a solution.

It remains to congratulate the editor for his energy in organizing the seminar, and the publication of these papers. He is particularly to be thanked for getting Steensgaard to do his excellent concluding general paper, for this goes at least some way towards imposing a theme on what is otherwise a rather diffuse collection. Certainly we hope the seminars will continue, and perhaps even become a little more self-conscious about what they hope to achieve.

University of NSW

M. N. PEARSON

Brigadier Lawrence FITZGERALD, *Java La Grande: The Portuguese Discovery of Australia*. The Publishers Pty Ltd, 1984, \$27.50.

Over the last few years we have been subjected to an intensive propaganda drive carried out with almost missionary zeal by those intent on converting us to their belief that the Portuguese, not the Dutch, were the first Europeans to discover Australia. The idea has obvious sensational and romantic appeal, laced, as it often is, with notions of 16th century spying; latterly the subject has expanded beyond the confines of the printed word and has been awarded that ultimate accolade of acceptance and respectability, a television documentary.

In this book Brigadier Fitzgerald starts with an introductory survey, listing what he considers to be the "more significant" of the Dieppe maps, the prime supposed evidence of Portuguese exploration of our coastline. He proceeds to summarise the arguments for and against the identification of the apparent continent of *Jave-la-Grande* as Australia, as provided by some, but by no means all of those who have written on the subject. Evidence is now available which authoritatively supports his outright dismissal of Kenneth McIntyre's widely accepted thesis regarding the imagined distortion of the east coast of 'Australia' on the Dieppe maps. The Brigadier does not really explain his reasons for this rejection, but by implication he obviously includes Kenneth McIntyre amongst those researchers who "were out of their depth in murky waters". It is difficult, however, to view his quoting of Professor Spate's observation regarding the futility of "any attempt to match each cape and bay with corresponding features on modern charts" as anything but a direct challenge, for in essence his book is precisely such an attempt.

After a review of navigational techniques, and chapters of historical background, several of which are rather peripheral to his thesis, he sets about explaining his "definitive solution of the gross distortions of the Dieppe maps". His case had started well enough in his introduction, by pointing out what most other writers have ignored, that a chart of a coastline as long as that of *Jave-la-Grande* would almost inevitably have had to be a small-scale compilation made from a number of larger scale charts. These would quite possibly have lacked indications of latitude, orientation and scale, so that the constituent parts could easily have been wrongly assembled by a compiler.

However, when he comes to reconstitute the sections of coastline which he believes to have been wrongly assembled, he commits two unpardonable errors. Firstly, he draws his 'evidence' from only two of the dozen or so versions available, the Dauphin or Harleian map, and the Desceliers 1550 one. Secondly, in matching up those coasts with its 'corresponding' features on the modern map, he flits from one to the other, depending on which he visualises as more closely resembling the modern outline of Australia. They say that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. The similarities Brigadier Fitzgerald apparently finds are evidently in his eye; it is doubtful whether many will be apparent to his readers.

He is original in one regard. Other writers have been puzzled by the named islands off the east coast of *Jave-la-Grande* and have consequently either ignored them completely or made some wild guesses as to their identity. The Brigadier believes he has recognised the *Saill* and *Magna* group on the Dauphin map as the Furneaux Islands in Bass Strait, even though they "are a thousand miles out of true location, and upside down". From that initial "discovery", he has gone on to identify "feature after feature from King Sound . . . to Bass Strait".

The fact that the Brigadier's 'corresponding' features fail to coincide with most of the correspondences seen by others who have tried the same exercise would seem to reflect the wisdom of Professor Spate's disregarded warning. To take but one example, the large *Cap de fremose* promontory on *Jave-la-Grande's* east coast has been variously identified as: the southern tip of Tasmania by C. Halls and Roger Hervé; Cape Howe by Ian McKiggan and Kenneth McIntyre, though for entirely different reasons; and the East Cape of New Zealand's North Island by Roger Hervé. The latter recently recanted from his previous belief, by accepting the accuracy of the latitude and, above all, the longitude coordinates provided by Jean Rotz. Only one other Dieppe map, in the Pierpont Morgan atlas, gives any longitude readings and they differ widely from those of Rotz. This is hardly surprising in view of the well-known difficulty then experienced in endeavouring to calculate longitude. Brigadier Fitzgerald does not even mention the Pierpont Morgan atlas and to all intents and purposes ignores Rotz. The Brigadier puts his money on Cape Portland, the NE cape of Tasmania. Any bets on any other capes? Is it not conceivable that this remarkable lack of consensus amongst those who believe in the Australian identification is because they are *all* wrong and that *Jave-la-Grande* is not Australia at all, but somewhere else? The Brigadier, however, is quite dogmatic regarding the correctness of his identifications; those who differ from his opinions are *ipso facto* wrong.

An examination of the Dieppe map reproductions which he provides explains, but certainly does not excuse, his almost exclusive reliance on the Dauphin and Desceliers 1550 maps. He has committed a fundamental sin against one of the cardinal principles of historical research by using not the originals or photographs of them but 19th century lithographic facsimiles. The only Dieppe maps he uses are those which were thus reproduced. He shows no signs of having even looked at any others. The puzzle of *Jave-la-Grande's* identity is vitally bound up with the faulty assembly of its constituent parts, and acceptance of that premise forms the very cornerstone of his whole thesis. The faulty manuscript copying of place-names and inscriptions, which he ignores, is likewise of enormous significance. Since lithographic copies inevitably introduce yet further errors, to rely exclusively on *these* for evidence is quite inexcusable and hardly likely to inspire confidence in any conclusions arrived at from the examination of them alone.

A very significant proportion of material relevant to the Dieppe maps is only available in French or Portuguese, and inscriptions on the maps themselves are primarily in those two languages, yet the Brigadier's bibliographical notes reveal an apparently exclusive reliance on works in English. He has obvious problems with place-names when he does notice them; thus he transcribes *Baye des Rvieres* (mod. *Rivières*, 'Bay of Rivers') as the nonsensical *Bay des Run-cies*. He further reveals his inability to deal with 16th century French by describing the texts of



the cartouches on the Desceliers map as being "in nondescript old French — difficult to interpret and to localise in spite of prominent headings". All the places mentioned are clearly identifiable and the inscriptions perfectly understandable, at least on the original! If he had looked at the original of the Vallard east coast map rather than a lithographic copy, he could never have complained that "the writing is so minute and indistinct that the names are practically beyond interpretation". Although admittedly occurring as part of a caption below the Brigadier's simplified redrawing of part of the Dauphin map, it is symptomatic of the cavalier treatment accorded to place-names, not merely by him, but by nearly all the writers on *Jave-la-Grande*, that he should specifically include "geographical place-names" as being amongst the "irrelevant detail" he has omitted.

Would anyone today buy a map for information and then concentrate exclusively on its geographical outlines, entirely disregarding the names of it? The fact that many inscriptions on the Dieppe maps are corruptions and that the script is not always easy to read, does not excuse the complete failure to take them into account. Study of the script and the names of 16th century maps and charts is at least as revealing as the coastal outlines on them.

Articles presumably published while Brigadier Fitzgerald's book was in press (for he shows no indication of having even heard of them) have used place-names *and* geographical outlines to show that *Jave-la-Grande* is almost certainly a composite creation made up of large-scale charts of parts of the south coast of Java itself and the coast of what is now Vietnam. The scale and orientation are wrong and they bear no very close resemblance to the coasts that their place-names proclaim them to be. Several factors would seem to account for their erroneous positioning. Firstly, the compiler, probably a Frenchman, was unable to identify them correctly, either from their outlines or from their place-names. Secondly, Magellan had discovered Tierra del Fuego just as non-Iberian cartographers were beginning to show the long-imagined, hypothetical continent of Terra Australis on their globes and maps. The island of Tierra del Fuego was taken to be concrete evidence of the continent's actual existence. Thirdly, Portuguese charts of Indonesia nearly all showed Java and some of the other islands with no southern coastlines, presumably because cartographers in Lisbon had not received information about them. Fourthly, the French seem to have been unaware of the fact that the Portuguese often used the term *Java Maior* for Java itself, consequently Java proper became confused in the minds of at least some of the Dieppe cartographers with the much misunderstood Java Major of Marco Polo. Inaccuracies in the transmission of his account, as the Brigadier himself explains, led people to believe he was referring to a large landmass somewhere south of Java. Marco Polo appeared to provide specific confirmation of the existence of land within the general area where wishful thinkers believed it to be. It would be difficult to find a more logical place to incorporate charts of unidentified coasts on a world map.

The Brigadier himself has fallen into a similar error when stating that by Java Major Marco Polo had meant not merely Java, which is correct, but also Australia. Such a deduction conveniently confirms what he wants to believe, but there is no evidence whatsoever to justify his statement and he makes no attempt to provide any.

Though the Brigadier still clings to some of the non-cartographic supposed evidence for Portuguese priority, realists should be grateful to him for giving wider currency to some recent criticism which completely demolishes the Carronade Island cannon and the Bittangabee 'fort' as complementary evidence, and provides a perfectly reasonable alternative explanation for the Geelong keys phenomenon.

It is therefore a pity that he gives his imagination free rein over some of the illustrative material on the Vallard east coast map, not the west coast one which he fails to mention. He is aware that blank spaces were anathema to many 16th century cartographers and that they would happily fill in such unaesthetic gaps with often fanciful illustrations which were quite unrelated to the areas thus decorated, yet he opts to believe in the validity of some, but not all of the illustrations on this one map. He selectively extracts from their surroundings and re-assembles what he takes to be a whale, a turtle, a crocodile, a dog, an iguana and some naked, spear-carrying natives. By the simple expedient of proclaiming the last three to be respectively a dingo, a goanna and Australian Aborigines, he announces that all these figures "present a picture as Australian in character as Vegemite and Foster's Lager". A comparison of pages xiv and 72 reveals that he missed a golden opportunity to really prove his case, for when searching for

unique Australiana on the Vallard map be evidently failed to observe that three members of his 'Aboriginal' group are riding camels, three centuries before Afghans were needlessly imported to look after them!

In the recent past we have been treated to ingenious redrawings of the coastlines of *Jave-la-Grande* in accordance with superficially impressive, possibly accurate, mathematical formulae based on utterly spurious premises. Brigadier Fitzgerald now juggles with sections of these same coasts as shown on only two of the Dieppe maps, in what is a decidedly unconvincing attempt to do what others have tried to do before him, namely, to force misplaced, unidentified coastlines on 16th century charts into the straitjacket of the modern outline of Australia, on the assumption that this was what they were intended to represent.

Let there be a moratorium on the erection of any more monuments to Portuguese navigators and let us postpone the rewriting of history textbooks until the available evidence in its entirety has been more carefully examined. The judicious selection and interpretation of apparent evidence can so easily be made to support an author's preconceived ideas, especially when inconvenient or perplexing factors such as toponymy are disregarded, misrepresented or suppressed. Mendonça, or some other Portuguese navigator may well have been the first European visitor to our shores, but so far, not a shred of reliable evidence has been produced by any of the enthusiastic advocates of the proposition.

*Flinders University of South Australia*

W. A. R. RICHARDSON

James LEES, *The Masting and Rigging of English Ships of War 1625-1860* (New Edition). London, Conway Maritime Press, 1984, 212 pp., ill.

This book is of great technical benefit and interest to ship modellers from beginners to the more experienced, who wish to rig a model authentically to any specific date ranging from 1625 to 1860. All the component parts of masts, sails and rigging can be correctly shaped according to these dates. This includes the order of dressing and where belaying points are, and also covers the makings of tops and practical seamanship as in various methods of splicing and types of blocks used. As a reference book, and for research work, the book is easy to read. However, a lot of cross referencing is needed when actually rigging a ship, following the normal stages of dressing masts, yards, etc. The extensive information contained in these areas gives an insight into the methods and practices of this era. Even the grey areas where no definite existing proof of date or rigging procedure is to be found, suggestions are put forward using the author's extensive experience and research to the most logical point as from the practical seaman's view point. This is aided with a wealth of descriptive drawings that even a first-time modeller could read, understand and follow, to achieve the desired level of detailed and accurate construction of the part being worked on. The photographs in this edition are clearer reproductions than in the previous edition, allowing more detail to be seen for research and reproduction of information in the various plates, and there is much fine detail to be gleaned from them by careful observation.

The author has based his work on averaging the dates shown in various sources and models, ignoring the small number of ships that were the exception and varied from the norm.

Masting and rigging of pre-clipper merchantships are not covered as little information is known about it, and the rig of the merchant ships depended solely on the captain or company who owned the ship, and did not conform to the rules and regulation of the Admiralty. The methods of mast construction are not fully covered as in the built-up mast or spar, as, for the modeller, they are not needed. If the student wishes to follow up, other works are available with this information.

The book is divided into sections covering masting, rigging, sailmaking, and appendices, proportions and tables.

MASTING has good detail on the fitting out of masts, yards, tops and bow sprits, not covering the construction of the building of masts, but all external fittings, beginning with the proportions of differing parts in relation to the masts. All the fittings and fastenings are dated through—e.g. the early wouldings to iron hoops, the changes to tops, trestle trees, caps and methods of construction over the period, the dressing-out of masts and yards with cleats, sheaves, iron hoops and bands, changes in shape of bees, cheeks and fish. Each section of a mast